



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,460	09/29/2003	Hiromu Sugiyama	0020-5182P	6659

2292 7590 03/21/2006

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH  
PO BOX 747  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

RUTHKOSKY, MARK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1745

DATE MAILED: 03/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/671,460

Applicant(s)

SUGIYAMA ET AL.

Examiner

Mark Ruthkosky

Art Unit

1745

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/2/06
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/30/2003.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Priority***

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement filed 10/29/2004 has been placed in the application file, and the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

### ***Drawings***

The drawings filed on 5/25/2004 have been approved.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claims 1 and 8, the phrase, "formed in the form of pattern" is indefinite, as it is unclear what this limitation means.

Claims 3 and 10 state that the Ivb group elements are the same as group 14. In some periodic tables, this may be accurate, however, in other periodic tables Group 14 is labeled IV A.

Art Unit: 1745

Thus, the relationship and the claim are indefinite. Using Group 14 or the listing of the elements of the group clearly defines the claimed group of elements. The IV group of claims 4 and 11 is indefinite for the same reason. In addition group Iv is used to identify more than one group in the periodic table. This group should be more clearly defined with respect to the elements of the group. Elements that are not capable of performing the claimed functions of alloying are not commensurate in scope with the disclosure.

With regard to the term “concave-convex pattern” in claims 6 and 13, it is not clear what the combination of the terms defines. The words convex and concave are well described, however, the combination of the terms is unclear. For the purposes of examination, the meaning is interpreted to be “either convex or concave.”

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda et al (EP 1,246,278.)

The instant claims are to an electrode used for a non-aqueous electrolyte secondary battery, which comprises a current collector of a metallic material which is not alloyed with Li and dots of a metallic material which is able to be alloyed with Li and is formed in a form of

Art Unit: 1745

pattern on the current collector, wherein the diameter of each dot is 1-500 micrometers, and the occupancy rate of the dots on the current collector is 50 - 90%.

Ikeda et al (EP 1,246,278) teaches an electrode used for a non-aqueous electrolyte secondary battery, which comprises a current collector of a metallic material (claim 35), which is not alloyed with Li and dots of a metallic material which are able to be alloyed with Li and formed in a form of pattern on the current collector (claims 1, 6, 7, 32-35 and 41, figures 10-11.) Materials of group Ivb is noted in claim 7. The materials are inherently porous as they are the same materials used in the instant application. Columnar portions are noted on the current collector with spaces provided around the column (p. 81.) The diameter of each dot is 1-500 micrometers (figs. 11-12). The thickness of the film is about 10 microns (p. 78-82.) Crystal grain sizes on the order of 10 microns are noted in Table 2. Means spacing of local peaks being greater than 5 microns are noted in Table 3. The surface roughness is on the order of 0.05-5 micron (p. 24.) Mixed layer alloys of Cu and group Iv elements are taught in claims 19-25 and p. 159-162. The dots are taught to be of an amorphous material (claims 9-15.)

The reference does not teach that the occupancy rate of the dots on the current collector is 50 - 90%. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include an occupancy rate in the range of 50-90% as the material of the dots is used to incorporate lithium in an anode, while open space is taught on the electrode surface for the expansion and contraction of the alloyed material. Lithium ions are intercalated into the material that forms the dots. It would be obvious to add the maximum amount of lithium occluding material on the electrode to increase the capacity of the battery. One skilled in the art would utilize as much lithium as possible in the battery, while allowing for opened spaces as taught in

Art Unit: 1745

Ikeda to reduce stress on the electrode by providing space on the electrode surface (see paragraphs 5-12 and 19-24.) The open spaces help to prevent for the loss of active material during charging and discharging of the battery. As the art recognizes the use of the lithium intercalating material and the advantage of open spaces on the electrode, adjusting the occupancy rate would be obvious to the skilled artisan in order to balance the amount of alloy material with the amount of space that is needed to prevent stress on the electrode (p. 19-26.) Where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation, *In re Aller, Lacey and Hall*, 105 U.S.P.Q. 233, 235. The artisan would have found the claimed invention to be obvious in light of the teachings of the references.

#### ***Examiner Correspondence***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Ruthkosky whose telephone number is 571-272-1291. The examiner can normally be reached on FLEX schedule (generally, Monday-Thursday from 9:00-6:30.) If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Ryan can be reached at 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 1745

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free.)

Mark Ruthkosky

Primary Patent Examiner

Art Unit 1745

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mark Ruthkosky".

3-17-2006